

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 16 and 17 have been amended. Claims 3, 5, 14 and 15 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-13, 16 and 17 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

II. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Specification stands objected to because the title of the invention is not descriptive. (See 2/20/08 Office Action, p. 2.) In view of the above amendment to the Title, it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

III. OBJECTION TO THE ABSTRACT

The Abstract stands objected to because it has not been provided on a separate sheet as required in 37 C.F.R. § 1.72(b). (See *id.*, pp. 2-3.) In view of the above amendment to the Abstract, it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 13, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by International Publication WO 01/20591 to Shannon et al. (hereinafter “Shannon”). (See *id.*, pp. 3-4.)

Claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the limitation “wherein storing the modified drive voltage comprises storing the drive voltage on a first capacitor (24) and storing a voltage

corresponding to the threshold voltage of the drive transistor on a second capacitor (40),” which the Examiner concedes is not taught in the prior art. (See *id.*, p. 10, ll. 4-7.) Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claim 16 depends from, and, therefore, includes all of the limitations of claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons.

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 9-12 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fig. 3 of Shannon in view of Fig. 5 of Shannon. (See *id.*, pp. 5-9.)

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation “wherein the circuit elements comprise a second photodiode (30) and a second storage capacitor (32), wherein the second photodiode (30) is connected between the gate of the drive transistor (22) and one terminal of the second storage capacitor (32), and the discharge photodiode (27) is connected between the one terminal and the power supply line (26),” which the Examiner concedes is not taught in the prior art. (See *id.*, p. 9, ll. 15-18.) Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 2, 4 and 6-10 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the limitation “circuit elements for changing an input data voltage applied to the pixel by an amount corresponding to the threshold voltage of the drive transistor, and for applying the changed data voltage between the gate and the source of the drive transistor (22), wherein the circuit elements comprise a second photodiode (30) and a second storage capacitor (32), wherein the second photodiode (30) is connected between the gate of the drive transistor (22) and one terminal of the second storage capacitor (32), and the discharge photodiode (27) is connected between the one terminal and the power supply line (26),” which the Examiner concedes is not taught in the prior art. (See *id.*) Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claim 12 depends from, and, therefore, includes all of

the limitations of claim 11, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the limitation “wherein storing the gate-source voltage comprises storing the gate-source voltage on a first capacitor (24) and storing a voltage corresponding to the threshold voltage of the drive transistor on a second capacitor (40).” The Applicants respectfully submit that this is analogous to the limitation “wherein storing the modified drive voltage comprises storing the drive voltage on a first capacitor (24) and storing a voltage corresponding to the threshold voltage of the drive transistor on a second capacitor (40),” which the Examiner has conceded is not taught by the prior art. (See id., p. 10, ll. 4-7.) Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 8, 2008

By: 

Michael J. Marcini (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcini, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel.: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276